UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,377	05/05/2006	Bei Wang	CN 030046	5700

24737 7590 12/07/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
BAROT, BHARAT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,377	WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bharat N. Barot	2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objection

2. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6 contains "A" in lines 3, 6, 8, and 10 should be –a--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites that "A kind of optical disc playing system…" and claim 11 recites that "A kind of method for transferring…", the phrase "a kind of" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "a kind of"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Other dependent claims, which are not specifically cited above are also rejected because of the deficiencies of their respective parent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Hirayama et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,343,405). Hirayama's patent meets all the limitations for claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, and 14-16 recited in the claimed invention.

7. As to claim 1, Hirayama et al teach an optical disc playing method (figures 1 and 16; column 4 lines 23-51; and column 14 line 52 to column 15 line 23), comprising: receiving a command from an user, which requires to play a part of content of a program in an optical disc; sending a request which requires to provide the related information of the part of content; receiving the related information; playing the disc in coordination with the part of content using the received related information (figure 7; and column 6 lines 13-55).

8. As to claims 4-5, Hirayama et al teach that the information corresponding to the part of content including the audio information and the caption information (figure 2; and column 4 lines 52-67).

9. As to claims 6 and 9-10, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1 and 4-5 above, since claims 6 and 9-10 are merely an apparatus for the method of operations defined in the method claims 1 and 4-5.

10. As to claim 11, Hirayama et al teach a method for transferring the downloaded information during playing (figures 7-8), comprising: receiving a downloading request which requires to download the information corresponding to the part of content of a program in the optical disc; identifying the content in the downloading request; and outputting the information corresponding to the content of the downloading request (figure 7 steps s4-s7; column 6 lines 28-55; figure 8 steps s22-s25; and column 6 line 65 to column 7 line 33).

11. As to claim 14, Hirayama et al teach that searching the information corresponding to the content of the downloading request (figure 8 step s23; and column 7 lines 2-19).

12. As to claims 15-16, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 4-5 above, since claims 15-16 do not teach or define any new limitations than above claims 4-5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 2-3, 7-8, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hirayama et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,343,405) in view of Klemets et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,451,229).

15. As to claims 2-3, Hirayama et al do not teach that the part of content of a program in the optical disc including a part of content corresponding to a play-list and the request also requiring to play a part of content of a program in the optical disc in a language selected by the user.

Klemets et al teach that the part of content of a program in the optical disc including a part of content corresponding to a play-list (figure 3; and column 6 line 55 to column 7 line 23) and the request also requiring to play a part of content of a program in the optical disc in a language selected by the user (figure 1; and column 7 line 65 to column 8 line 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Klemets et al stated above in the method of Hirayama et al for playing optical disc because it would have improved control for optical disc player and increased efficiency and utilization of the optical disc player.

16. As to claims 7-8, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 2-3 above, since claims 7-8 are merely an apparatus for the method of operations defined in the method claims 2-3.

17. As to claims 12-13, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 2-3 above, since claims 12-13 do not teach or define any new limitations than above claims 2-3.

Additional Reference

18. The examiner as of general interest cites the following reference.

a. Danner et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,219,136.

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

/Bharat N Barot/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455

December 03, 2009